



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/470,645	12/22/1999	NICK N. NIKOLS	26530.6	6402

27683 7590 05/05/2003

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100
DALLAS, TX 75202

EXAMINER

CAO, DIEM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/470,645

Applicant(s)

NIKOLS ET AL.

Examiner

Diem K Cao

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 3/5/2003.
2. Claims 1-7 and 9-22 are remained in the application. Applicant has cancelled claim 8, and amended claims 7, 9, 13, and 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer et al. (U.S. 6,125,391) in view of Ellesson et al. (U.S. 6,101,541).

As to claim 15, Meltzer teaches receiving an event (input document; col. 83, lines 29-44) from an application (originating participant node; col. 83, lines 29-44, market participants; col. 9, lines 29-55), transforming the event to a predetermined format (translated to the format of the host; col. 83, lines 29-44) by a transformation processor (document parser 1102, document translator 1103; col. 82, lines 26-50), transmitting the transformed event to a service application in the server (the formatted events and objects are passed to the router service, identified services; col. 83, lines 29-44).

However, Meltzer does not explicitly teach a distributed directory, Meltzer teaches transmitting the transformed event to another application (management server), and the market maker server node functions as a distributed directory (The market maker is a server ... legacy

Art Unit: 2126

systems; col. 82, lines 58-67). Ellesson teaches (col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 3) an event (request) from an application (client node) is transmitted to a directory (directory server 103).

It would have been obvious that the management server in the system of Meltzer could be a distributed directory as taught by Ellesson because the distributed directory also offers client with much more functionalities such as eliminate of server overload and encrypted data.

As to claim 16, Meltzer teaches converting the event into markup language data prior to transforming the event (the output is transformed back to the XML format; col. 25, lines 14-24).

As to claim 17, Meltzer teaches providing a transformation profile (logical structures; col. 23, lines 51-63, XSL style sheet; col. 81, lines 24-57).

As to claim 1, Meltzer teaches a transformation profile (logical structures; col. 23, lines 51-63, XSL style sheet; col. 81, lines 24-57), an event (output data of the service; col. 83, lines 29-44), transforming the event (translating ... host system; col. 23, lines 51-63) by using a transformation tool (translator module 302; col. 23, lines 51-63) and the transformation profile, providing the transformed event to the application (commercial functions 305, database functions 306, etc.; col. 23, line 64 – col. 24, line 53), the application becomes aware of the event (receipt of product description; col. 25, lines 4-14).

However, Meltzer does not explicitly teach a distributed directory, Meltzer teaches transmitting the transformed event to another application (management server), and the market maker server node functions as a distributed directory (The market maker is a server ... legacy systems; col. 82, lines 58-67). Ellesson teaches (col. 4, lines 30-59) an event (a triggered event) from a directory (directory server 103) is transmitted to an application (client nodes 105, 107 and 109).

It would have been obvious that the management server in the system of Meltzer could be a distributed directory as taught by Ellesson because the distributed directory also offers client with much more functionalities such as eliminate of server overload and encrypted data.

As to claim 2, Meltzer teaches converting the event into markup language data prior to transforming the event (the output is converted to the XML format; col. 83, lines 41-44).

As to claim 3, Meltzer teaches providing an application shim (process front end 304; col. 23, lines 51-63) to receive the transformed event and provide the event to the application (commercial functions 305, database functions 306, etc.; col. 23, line 64 – col. 24, line 53).

However, Meltzer does not explicitly teach using a native application program interface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that there is a native API for each application in order for the process front end to route the event to the application.

As to claim 4, Meltzer teaches updating the transformation profile responsive to changes in the application (the business interface ... kept up to date; col. 25, lines 34-43). However, Meltzer does not explicitly teach updating the application shim. It would have been obvious that application shim could be updated along with the transformation file because the application needs to be updated.

As to claim 5, Meltzer teaches the transformation profile includes a style sheet (XSL style sheet; col. 81, lines 24-57).

As to claim 6, Meltzer does not explicitly teach the transformation profile is stored in the directory. Meltzer teaches the transformation profile is stored in the database in the participant module (col. 23, lines 51-63 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, there would be no different of the place to store the transformation file.

As to claim 18, it is the same as the method of claim 1 except it is a computer product claim. Meltzer also teaches applications are reside in different computer (col. 9, lines 9-29). Therefore, a first processor, a second processor, a first memory, a second memory are in the system inherently.

As to claim 19, refer to claim 2 above for rejection.

As to claim 20, refer to claim 3 above for rejection.

As to claim 21, refer to claim 17 above for rejection.

As to claim 22, refer to claim 1 above for rejection regarding the transformation profile and the transformation tool.

5. Claims 7, and 9 -14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer et al. in view of Ellesson et al. further in view of Bayeh et al. (U.S. 6,012,098).

As to claim 7, Meltzer teaches receiving an event (output data of the service; col. 83, lines 29-44), converting the event into XML data (the output is converted to the XML format; col. 83, lines 41-44), transforming the XML data (translating ... host system; col. 23, lines 51-63) to a first predetermined format by a transformation processor (translator module 302; col. 23, lines 51-63), the first format being responsive to an application (translating ... host system; col. 23, lines 51-63), and transmitting the transformed data to the application (commercial functions 305, database functions 306, etc.; col. 23, line 64 – col. 24, line 53).

However, Meltzer does not explicitly teach a first event, a first predetermined format, a third event, a third predetermined format. However, Meltzer teaches a market maker server handles the translation tasks from the format of the documents being received and transmitted, to and from the formats of the respective host systems. It would have been obvious the system of

Art Unit: 2126

Meltzer teaches a first event, a first predetermined format, a third event, a third predetermined format and much more.

However, Meltzer does not explicitly teach a distributed directory, Meltzer teaches transmitting the transformed event to another application (management server), and the market maker server node functions as a distributed directory (The market maker is a server ... legacy systems; col. 82, lines 58-67). Ellesson teaches (col. 4, lines 30-59) an event (a triggered event) from a directory (directory server 103) is transmitted to an application (client nodes 105, 107 and 109). It would have been obvious that the management server in the system of Meltzer could be a distributed directory as taught by Ellesson because the distributed directory also offers client with much more functionalities such as eliminate of server overload and encrypted data.

However, Meltzer does not explicitly teach an XML generator to generate XML data. Meltzer teaches a document translator and input documents are translated to XML documents (col. 82, lines 26-50). Bayeh teaches an XML generator to generate XML data (data servlet formats ... XML data stream; col. 8, lines 13-29). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Bayeh to the system of Meltzer to including a XML generator because XML generator are well known in the art and well established.

However, Meltzer does not teach the transformation processor includes an XSLT processor, the program further comprising instructions for providing a style sheet to the XSLT processor, the style sheet including formatting instructions for transforming XML data to the first predetermined format, and providing a third style sheet to the XSLT processor, the third style sheet including formatting instructions for transforming XML data to the third predetermined format wherein the first style sheet is different from the third style sheet. Meltzer teaches a

Art Unit: 2126

document to host and host to document translator 1103 (col. 82, lines 26-50), and for each BID, there is an association XML DTD, a Java Bean, a XSL style sheet and an un-marshaling program (col. 81, lines 24-43). It is well known in the art that style sheet is used to transform XML document to another XML document, and XSL processor performs the translation task. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to update the system of Meltzer by providing the XSL processor because it provides a method for the users to receive the data that they could use.

As to claim 9, Meltzer teaches updating the transformation profile responsive to changes in the application (the business interface ... kept up to date; col. 25, lines 34-43)

As to claim 10, refer to claim 3 above for rejection.

As to claim 11, Meltzer modified by Elleson teaches detecting the event through notification from an event handler of the distributed directory (event listener; col. 10, lines 46-65 and Fig. 11).

As to claim 12, refer to claim 16 above for rejection.

As to claim 13, see rejection of claim 7 above regarding the teaching of style sheet and XSL processor.

As to claim 14, refer to claim 3 above for rejection.

Response to Arguments

Claims 1, 15, and 18

As to Applicant's arguments (page 6, 16 – page 7, line 9) regarding the improper combination of Meltzer and Elleson. Applicant argues that Meltzer does not teach the use of directory, and Elleson teaches communicating between a directory server and client nodes using

Art Unit: 2126

a standard access protocol. Applicant further argues that the claimed invention was used as an instruction to combine the teaching of Meltzer and Elleson. Examiner is strongly disagree because Meltzer teaches the market maker server node functions as a distributed directory (The market maker is a server ... legacy systems; col. 82, lines 58-67). The reference of Elleson is used for better teaching of a distributed directory (see rejections of claim 1 above).

Applicant further argues Elleson does not teach converting or transforming data from a myriad of application formats into a single directory format and vice versa. However, such limitation is never claimed before in any of claims 1, 15, or 18. The argument therefore is not persuasive.

Claims 7-14

As to Applicant's arguments (page 7, lines 10-23) regarding the combination of Meltzer, Elleson, and Bayeh does not teach all the limitations of claim 7. Although the claim 7 was amended to add new limitations that were not claimed before, new limitations are also taught by Meltzer, Elleson and Bayeh (see rejection of claim 7 above).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2126

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-5220. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-6296 for regular communications and (703) 305-9731 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7238.
- OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7239.
- NON-OFFICIAL/DRAFT faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746-7140.

Diem Cao
April 30, 2003

Sue Lee